

REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 4, 2006, in which the Examiner made the rejections of claims 1, 10-12 and 14 final, allowed claims 15-18 and 23-33, and objected to claims 3, 9 and 13. With this amendment, Applicant has amended claim 1 and added new claims 36 and 37. Entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

On February 2, 2006, Applicant's representative, Brian D. Kaul, had a teleconference with Examiner Paul D. Kim, during which the Examiner's assessment of the Jones, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,190,872) reference was discussed. In particular, Applicant pointed out that the Jones, Jr. et al. reference relates to a longitudinal writing element, rather than the perpendicular writing element, to which the claims of the present invention are directed. Additionally, the Examiner explained that the top portion and the beveled portion of the cited writing pole portion 15 are shown in FIG. 2 Jones, Jr. et al. at approximately the location indicated by the leader for X.

No issues were resolved. The Examiner requested that Applicant file this response.

Claim Amendments

With this Amendment, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 and added new claims 36 and 37, each of which depends from independent claim 1. No excess claim fees are due.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to clarify the thickness of the writing pole portion in an effort to move the application to allowance. The thickness of the writing pole portion is now defined with greater specificity as being "measured

in a direction that is substantially parallel to the air bearing surface and in a plane that is perpendicular to the air bearing surface and extends through the top portion and the beveled portion."

New claim 36 provides that "the beveled portion increases the thickness of the writing pole portion from the pole tip." In addition to being unrelated to perpendicular writing elements, Jones, Jr. et al. fail to disclose such a beveled portion. Rather, the thickness of the cited writing pole portion 15 of Jones, Jr. et al. remain substantially constant from the pole tip P, as shown in FIG. 2.

New claim 37 provides that "the beveled portion increases the thickness of a portion of the writing pole portion with distance from the air bearing surface." Jones, Jr. et al. fail to disclose such a beveled portion. Rather, the cited beveled portion only increases the thickness of the cited writing pole portion 15 along a plane that does not extend through the cited top pole portion and the beveled pole portion, as shown in FIG. 3.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that new claims 36 and 37 are allowable in view of the cited reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 10, 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jones, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,190,872). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the cited reference.

The Examiner found Jones, Jr. et al. to disclose all of the steps of independent claim 1 including "forming a ramped step having a high side, a low side, and a ramp portion connecting the high side to the low side" at element 17 shown in FIG. 2. The Examiner also asserts that element 15 is a writing pole portion having "a top portion overlaying a beveled portion." However, the

Examiner fails to identify what portions of element 15 constitute the top and beveled portions. During the interview summarized above, the Examiner only provided that the top and bottom portions of element 15 were near the leader for X in FIG. 2. Even with that information, Applicant cannot ascertain what parts of element 15 of Jones, Jr. et al. constitute the claimed top and bottom portions.

Even so, Applicant submits that element 15 cannot be construed as disclosing the claimed top and beveled portions. In particular, the "pole tip" of element 15 "having an air bearing surface" must be construed as the portion immediately above the leader for 18 that is at the ABS surface shown in FIG. 2. If that "pole tip" of element 15 has "a thickness substantially corresponding to a thickness of the top portion", as described in claim 1, then the "top portion" of element 15 extends to the lowest level of element 15, which is the top surface of element 18 in the "POLE TIP REGION" shown in FIG. 2. As a result, the "top portion" of element 15 is not "overlying a beveled portion", as provided in claim 1.

Moreover, even if one construes the top and beveled portions of the cited writing pole portion 15 of Jones, Jr. et al. to be located at the leader for X, the thickness of element 15 remains constant in that region, as shown in FIG. 2. Accordingly, regardless of the precise portion of element 15 that the Examiner found to correspond to the claimed "beveled portion", that "beveled portion" does not increase a thickness of the writing pole portion, as described in claim 1.

Additionally, independent claim 1 is directed to "a method of forming a beveled writing pole of a perpendicular writing element". It is significant that the preamble does not state an intended use or purpose of the method. Instead, the preamble defines what the invention is.

Unlike the method of independent claim 1, Jones, Jr. et

al. is directed to a longitudinal writing element. This is clearly shown in FIG. 3 of Jones, Jr. et al. where the writing element comprises two writing poles 14 and 15, each of which have the same cross-sectional area at the pole tip region P. The longitudinal writing element of Jones, Jr. et al. is distinguishable from perpendicular writing elements that utilize a single writing pole (144) whose pole tip (154) has a cross-sectional area that is substantially less than that of the pole tip (156) of the return pole (140), as shown in FIGS. 2 and 3 of the present application and described on page 6, line 25 through page 9, line 9. Differences between perpendicular and longitudinal writing elements are also discussed in the background of the present application. Those skilled in the art of thin film inductive heads understand these and other significant differences between perpendicular and longitudinal writing elements.

Therefore, Jones, Jr. et al. is unrelated to the method of independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation against independent claim 1, and requests the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicant submits that claims 10, 12 and 14 for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones, Jr. et al. Applicant submits that claim 11 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to independent claim 1, and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above comments and remarks, Applicant

submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Brian E. Kaul, Reg. No. 41,885
Suite 1400 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

BDK/djb